

alert personnel to excessive radiation levels and allow them to initiate appropriate safety actions. The low probability of an inadvertent criticality, together with the licensee's adherence to GDC 63 standards, constitutes good cause for granting an exemption to the requirements of 10 CFR 70.24.

#### IV

The Commission has determined that pursuant to 10 CFR 70.14, this exemption is authorized by law, will not endanger life or property or the common defense and security, and is otherwise in the public interest. Therefore, the Commission hereby grants the licensee an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 70.24 for the James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that the granting of this exemption will not result in any significant adverse environmental impact (63 FR 34205).

This exemption is effective upon issuance.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 24th day of June 1998

**Samuel J. Collins,**

*Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 98-17611 Filed 7-1-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 72-9]

### Notice of Issuance of Amendment to Materials License SNM-2504, Public Service Company of Colorado, Fort St. Vrain Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has issued Amendment 5 to Materials License No. SNM-2504 held by the Public Service Company of Colorado (PSCo) for the receipt, possession, storage, and transfer of spent fuel at the Fort St. Vrain (FSV) independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI), located in Weld County, Colorado. The amendment is effective as of the date of issuance.

By application dated November 25, 1997, PSCo requested an amendment to revise Materials License SNM-2504 and the Technical Specifications for the FSV ISFSI to (1) replace 10 CFR 50 Program references with stand-alone ISFSI program references due to the termination of the FSV 10 CFR part 50 license, (2) delete references to

previously authorized material that is not stored at the ISFSI, and (3) revise the Technical Specifications to accurately reflect the current ISFSI activities.

This amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

In accordance with 10 CFR 72.46(b)(2), a determination has been made that the amendment does not present a genuine issue as to whether public health and safety will be significantly affected. Therefore, the publication of a notice of proposed action and an opportunity for hearing or a notice of hearing is not warranted. Notice is hereby given of the right of interested persons to request a hearing by July 31, 1998, on whether the action should be rescinded or modified.

The Commission has determined that the issuance of the amendment will not result in any significant environmental impact and that, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(c)(10)(ii), an environmental assessment need not be prepared in connection with issuance of the amendment.

Documents related to this action are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room located at the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 24th day of June 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**William F. Kane,**

*Director, Spent Fuel Project Office, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 98-17610 Filed 7-1-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251]

### Turkey Point Plant, Units 3 and 4; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulation Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-31 and DPR-41 for the Turkey Point Plant, Units 3 and 4, respectively, issued to the Florida

Power and Light Company (the licensee).

## Environmental Assessment

### Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action is in response to the licensee's application dated March 5, 1998, for exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4) regarding submission of revisions to the updated Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR). Under the proposed exemption, the licensee would schedule updates to a single, unified FSAR for the two units based on the refueling cycle of Unit 4 and at intervals not to exceed 24 months.

### The Need for the Proposed Action

The Code of Federal Regulations, 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4), requires licensees to submit updates to their FSAR annually or within 6 months after each refueling outage providing that the interval between successive updates does not exceed 24 months. Since Units 3 and 4 share a common FSAR, the licensee must update the same document annually or within 6 months after a refueling outage for either unit. The underlying purpose of the rule was to relieve licensees of the burden of filing annual FSAR revisions while assuring that such revisions are made at least every 24 months. The Commission reduced the burden, in part, by permitting a licensee to submit its FSAR revisions 6 months after refueling outages for its facility, but did not provide for multiple unit facilities sharing a common FSAR in the rule. Rather, the Commission stated: "With respect to the concern about multiple facilities sharing a common FSAR, licensees will have maximum flexibility for scheduling updates on a case-by-case basis." 57 FR 39355 (1992). Allowing the exemption would maintain the updated FSAR current within 24 months of the last revision.

### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that it involves administrative activities unrelated to plant operation.

The proposed action will not result in an increase in the probability or consequences of accidents or result in a change in occupational exposure or offsite dose. Therefore, there are no significant radiological impacts associated with the proposed action.

The proposed action will not result in a change in nonradiological plant effluents and will have no other nonradiological environmental impact.